

forcing every American to report any transaction of \$600 or more to the IRS, giving the Federal Government unprecedented access into the personal finances of American families. We can expect more of the same from them now.

Maya Angelou was right when she said:

When someone shows you who they are, believe them the first time.

Now, we just heard what our Democrat colleagues are saying in objecting to this commonsense solution to avoid a government shutdown. They are saying that our proposal will cut services. Passing the CR into next year will not result in any cuts to funding or services; it will simply continue government operations just as they are today.

Here is the deal. For too long, the failed and ridiculous thinking in Washington has been that budgets don't matter and inflation doesn't matter because voters will never tie wasteful spending to inflation. The only way to get some things done is to shove them into a giant spending bill negotiated in secret and pass it before anyone has any time to read it. That is wrong, and the American public is disgusted with this. It is not how any family or business operates.

In the real world, you make plans, you meet deadlines, you make choices and live within your means, because failing to do so means failing to survive and prosper.

Congress shouldn't be treated any differently. Congress has been broken and unaccountable for too long.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Utah.

Mr. LEE. Mr. President, in closing this discussion, I just want to respond to a couple of points made by my friend and colleague, the distinguished Senator from Vermont.

Senator LEAHY is someone I have really enjoyed working with throughout my 12 years in the Senate, and I will miss him when he is gone.

I respectfully but very strongly disagree with his decision to object to this commonsense approach toward avoiding a government shutdown, and I want to make clear just a few things.

No. 1, this continuing resolution is not preclusive of anything else he may want to do. It doesn't preclude anyone from still working to pass an omnibus. It, rather, provides a safety net so that Congress doesn't produce a government shutdown and, just as importantly, so that Members don't feel coerced into this dual threat of having to navigate between the Scylla of a threatened shutdown and the Charybdis of people having to cancel their holiday plans with their families. That is what we are trying to avoid. So it is a false choice to say that this doesn't allow for anything else. That is just not true.

Now, I disagree with him about his desire to pass an omnibus because that omnibus doesn't yet exist. There still isn't an agreement on it. The bill has

yet to exist and has yet to see the light of day, not only to the public but to all but four Members of the United States Congress. That is what I object to.

But make no mistake: What we are proposing today, what we are reasonably suggesting today, would not preclude a subsequent omnibus; it would just take away the shutdown threat—which is exactly my point, which is exactly my concern. When we do this sort of thing—without speaking to anyone's subjective motives; I can't read other people's minds, but I do know that this pattern has been used before. It is a tried-and-true process by which people convince their colleagues to vote for things they would never otherwise vote for because, typically, we don't like to vote on things that we haven't seen and spend trillions of dollars.

My colleague from Vermont also refers to the fact that he has had lengthy conversations with a number of colleagues coming to him with their concerns. That is great. I appreciate that. That is a very appropriate thing for any Senator to do, particularly the chairman of the Appropriations Committee. As great as that is, that isn't legislating. That doesn't substitute for actual floor debate, and it sure as heck doesn't substitute for transparency and accountability, allowing the American people to see what they are going to be spending their money on.

We are going to get, in a matter of days, probably in about a week—usually, they don't give us more time than that—a bill. It will be 2,000 or 3,000 pages long, and it will spend probably 1.6 or \$1.7 trillion.

And the American people understand that 2,000 or 3,000 pages of appropriations legislative text does not read like a fast-paced novel. Nobody is going to have a chance to review this, and that is the problem. So the fact that he is meeting with individual Members, hearing their concerns, and talking about possible tradeoffs—that is great, but it doesn't provide what the American people need.

Next, he appeals to the sense of the good things that will be in the bill, talking about the need to fund efforts to combat opioid abuse and addiction and the need to fund law enforcement—great things, great things—but we haven't seen the legislative text, and the fact that there may be good things in the bill funding good causes that would benefit good, deserving beneficiaries doesn't mean that the bill as a whole makes any sense.

He also says, with some defiance and indignation, that he is not going to settle for another short-term CR, that short-term CRs are a bad way of doing things, and he is not OK with a short-term CR.

It is a good point. I am not either. I don't like them. It is a default.

But we have been on a short-term CR since September 30. That is 2½ months. So I don't comprehend exactly where he would draw the line between a short-term CR that is acceptable and

one that isn't. So 2½ months is just fine but a few more weeks isn't?

I suspect it is going to be fine when somebody comes to the floor and asks for a 1-week, short-term CR—a 1-week, short-term spending bill.

That is wrong. Why? Because it moves the threat of a shutdown that much closer to Christmas when Members most want to get out of town and when the American people and those they elect to represent them here are most concerned about a shutdown.

That is coercive. That isn't trying to avoid a shutdown. No. That is playing with fire. That is presenting as a feature, not a bug, the risk of a shutdown. It is wrong, and it has to stop.

Look, the objective today—I hope he will reconsider. This isn't right. We know it isn't right. Those who elected us, whether we are Republicans or Democrats deserve better. They don't deserve this.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. (Mr. PETERS). The Senator from Nevada.

IMMIGRATION REFORM

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. President, I rise today to express my strong and continued support for Dreamers, TPS recipients, and immigrant communities in Nevada and across our Nation.

It has been decades since Congress has passed real immigration reform, and almost a decade since we have made a real attempt at taking action to provide a permanent solution for those communities and allow families—allow families to stay together. As a result, our broken immigration system has been left with a patchwork of policies that are outdated and inefficient. This is why Congress needs to take action now on comprehensive immigration reform, so we can, once and for all, fix this severely broken system.

It shouldn't be a partisan issue. We are talking about families who deserve peace of mind about their future. They shouldn't be subjected to the uncertainty they currently face every single day.

Unfortunately, some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to come to the table to work with us on comprehensive immigration reform. They would rather leave Dreamers in limbo and have this issue for their own political gain than work toward solutions.

But a number of reasonable Republicans have said in the past that they do support a legislative fix to protect our Dreamers and their futures. So let's start there and work together to provide an immediate, permanent legislative solution for DACA recipients right now—right now—while at the same time, we keep working for more comprehensive immigration reform.

In the 10 years since the DACA program first went into effect, it has protected nearly 600,000 Dreamers and allowed them to make a home and build a life and a future here in our country. In my State of Nevada alone, thousands of individuals and families rely on DACA to live, work, and raise a

family, free from fear in a country—the only country they have ever known or ever called home.

DACA has provided vital protections and opportunities for Dreamers, ensuring that they can attend college, fully contribute to our economy, serve in our military, and really make a difference in our communities.

Because of DACA, thousands of people have been given access to the American dream. And yet yearslong threats to end this policy have left nearly 600,000 DACA recipients in limbo, facing uncertainty and awaiting court decision after court decision that can jeopardize their future and threaten the lives that they have built here.

So we cannot wait any longer to take action. That is why I am calling on my colleagues to work to pass a permanent legislative solution this year—this year—for Dreamers, one that gives them permanent protections and a pathway to citizenship, while we continue working on comprehensive immigration reform.

So let's put a stand-alone proposal to provide a permanent legislative fix for DACA recipients. Let's put that proposal right here on the Senate floor and take a vote immediately to solve this issue.

We must also continue to keep fighting. We have to keep fighting to ensure we take a comprehensive approach to reforming our immigration system and finally giving these families the peace of mind they so richly deserve.

Families across our country deserve certainty in their futures, and the Senate must feel the same sense of urgency that they feel every single day. We can't keep them waiting any longer.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

UNANIMOUS CONSENT AGREEMENT—S.J. RES. 56

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I ask that the previous order with respect to the motion to discharge be vitiated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, I further ask that I be allowed to speak for up to 30 minutes, Senator RISCH for up to 5 minutes, and Senator MENENDEZ for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

YEMEN

Mr. SANDERS. Mr. President, this is an issue that I and a number of us Democrats and Republicans, progressives and conservatives, have been working on for a number of years.

I was disappointed that the Biden administration has announced its opposition to the resolution I am bringing forth, but we have been in communica-

tion with the administration all day, and just a few minutes ago, we have received a commitment from them that they will work with us to end the war in Yemen and bring peace to that very troubled region.

I don't know if the administration and those of us who want to go forward will end up being in agreement. If not, I assure the Members that we will be back with a resolution in the very near future, as soon as we can, because this is an issue that I and many of us feel passionately about.

To the Members, I am not going to ask for a vote tonight, but I do want to express my concerns, deep concerns, about what is going on in that region.

In 2014, with the active support of the U.S. military, Saudi Arabia, the UAE and a coalition of other countries intervened in the civil war in Yemen. The result of that intervention was the creation of the worst humanitarian crisis on the planet, and it really is almost hard to imagine what is going on in that impoverished country.

Since the war began in 2015, over 377,000 people have been killed, including at least 130,000 people who have died from indirect causes like food insecurity and lack of healthcare as a direct result of the Saudi blockade of Yemen and the humanitarian obstruction by warring parties.

Today, nearly 25 million Yemenis are in need of humanitarian assistance, 5 million are at risk of famine, and over a million are affected by cholera. According to UNICEF, by the end of this calendar year, nearly 18 million people, including over 9 million children, will lack access to safe water, sanitation, and hygiene services in Yemen, leading to regular outbreaks of preventable diseases like cholera, measles, and diphtheria.

The 8-year war in Yemen has internally displaced over 4 million people, making Yemen home to one of the largest internal displacement crises in the world, with women and children bearing the brunt of that burden.

According to the United Nations Population Fund, nearly 77 percent—or 3 million—of those displaced in Yemen are women and children. Every 2 hours, a Yemeni woman dies during childbirth, an almost entirely preventable crisis. Furthermore, in Yemen today, more than a million pregnant and breastfeeding women are acutely malnourished, a number we may see double with rising food insecurity.

According to the international relief organization Oxfam, the threat of famine is very serious. Despite ongoing humanitarian assistance, over 17 million people in Yemen remain food insecure, a number set to rise to 19 million by the end of this year. In Yemen today, over a million pregnant or breastfeeding women and over 2 million children under 5 require treatment for acute malnutrition—acute malnutrition.

And if you think the suffering in that country cannot get any worse, unfortu-

nately, you would be dead wrong. The United Nations reports that, if the conflict doesn't stop, the war in Yemen could lead to the deaths of 1.3 million people by the year 2030.

And let us be crystal clear: The initiators of this terrible war in Yemen were Saudi Arabia, one of the very most dangerous countries on the face of this Earth. Saudi Arabia is a dictatorship that is doing everything that it can to crush democracy in its own country. It is a brutal regime that treats women as third-class citizens and tortures civilians. It is one of the worst human rights violators in the world.

Saudi Arabia's Crown Prince, as I think many of us are familiar with, Muhammad bin Salman, ordered the murder of Jamal Khashoggi, a Washington Post columnist and American resident, with a bone saw in 2018. And there is little doubt about that.

In a blatant attempt to jack up gas prices in the United States and harm our economy, Saudi Arabia agreed to partner with Vladimir Putin in the murderous war against the people of Ukraine.

At a time when children in Yemen are facing mass starvation, when that impoverished country's healthcare system is collapsing, Saudi Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman bought himself a \$500 million yacht, a \$300 million French chateau, and a \$450 million Leonardo da Vinci painting. And he can afford to do this because their family is worth some \$1.4 trillion, one of the wealthiest, if not the wealthiest, families in the entire world.

According to Freedom House, a respected human rights organization:

Saudi Arabia's absolute monarchy restricts almost all political rights and civil liberties. No officials at the national level are elected. The regime relies on pervasive surveillance, the criminalization of dissent, appeals to sectarianism and ethnicity, and public spending supported by oil revenues to maintain power. Women and religious minorities face extensive discrimination in law and in practice.

According to Human Rights Watch, under the government headed by Crown Prince Muhammad bin Salman, "Saudi Arabia has experienced the worst period of repression in its modern history." Human Rights Watch has reported that "accounts have emerged of alleged torture of high-profile political detainees in Saudi prisons," including Saudi women's rights activists and others. The alleged torture included electric shocks, beatings, whippings, and sexual harassment.

Enough is enough. We must fundamentally reassess our relationship with the murderous regime of Saudi Arabia. We can and we must begin to do that by ending our support for the Saudi-led war in Yemen, and that is why I have introduced a resolution that requires the United States to withdraw its forces from and involvement in the Saudi-led war in Yemen, which has not been authorized by the U.S. Congress.